UNITED
NATIONS

E

Economic and Social
Council

PROVISIONAL

E/1994/SR.49
25 January 1995

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

Substantive session of 1994

PROVISIONAL SUMMARY RECORD OF THE 49th MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Friday, 29 July 1994, at 3 p.m.

President: Mr. BUTLER (Australia)

CONTENTS

REGIONAL COOPERATION IN THE ECONOMIC, SOCIAL AND RELATED FIELDS (continued)

PERMANENT SOVEREIGNTY OVER NATIONAL RESOURCES IN THE OCCUPIED PALESTINIAN AND OTHER ARAB TERRITORIES (continued)

COORDINATION QUESTIONS (continued)

(b) INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION IN THE FIELD OF INFORMATICS (continued)

(c) MULTISECTORAL COLLABORATION ON TOBACCO OR HEALTH (continued)

PROGRAMME AND RELATED QUESTIONS IN THE ECONOMIC, SOCIAL AND RELATED FIELDS (continued)

QUESTION OF DECLARING 1998 INTERNATIONAL YEAR OF THE OCEAN (continued)

QUESTION OF DECLARING 1995 INTERNATIONAL YEAR TO OBSERVE THE ONE THOUSANDTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE MANAS EPIC (continued)

SUSPENSION OF THE SESSION

Corrections to this record should be submitted in one of the working languages. They should be set forth in a memorandum and also incorporated in a copy of the record. They should be sent within one week of the date of this document to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, Office of Conference Services, room DC2-794, 2 United Nations Plaza.

The meeting was called to order at 3.25 p.m.

REGIONAL COOPERATION IN THE ECONOMIC, SOCIAL AND RELATED FIELDS (continued) (E/1994/L.42)

Draft resolution E/1994/L.42

The PRESIDENT informed the Council that Austria, Belgium, Benin, Brazil, Estonia, Greece, Ireland, Italy, the Netherlands and Poland had joined the sponsors of draft resolution E/1994/L.42 entitled "Middle East peace process".

Mr. COHEN (United States of America) said that Ghana, Jordan, Luxembourg, the Republic of Moldova and Ukraine had also become sponsors.

Mr. ELIASHIV (Observer for Israel) said that Israel welcomed and supported the draft resolution, following the adoption of General Assembly resolution 48/58. Indeed, Israel had supported the idea from its very inception. The draft resolution, of which his country was a sponsor, reflected the support of the international community for the ongoing peace process. It also reflected the historic developments in the Middle East, including the Declaration of Principles on Interim Self-Government Arrangements, signed by Israel and the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) in Washington, D.C., on 13 September 1993; the subsequent Agreement on the Gaza Strip and the Jericho area, signed by the Government of Israel and the PLO in Cairo on 4 May 1994; the Agreement between Israel and Jordan on the Common Agenda, signed in Washington, D.C., on 14 September 1993; and the Washington Declaration, signed by Israel and Jordan on 25 July 1994. Those developments had been made possible by the ongoing peace process, started at Madrid and were based on the principle of direct negotiations between the parties without preconditions. That process was creating an opportunity for an era of peace, security, cooperation and progress in the Middle East.

The draft resolution marked another step forward in adapting United Nations resolutions to the new reality in the Middle East. His delegation hoped that further steps would be taken in order to ensure that the resolutions of the Council, the General Assembly and other United Nations bodies reflected the new positive developments in the region. Peace and development were indivisible. Economic and social development could be achieved only through cooperation, not through confrontation.

Mr. SHREIM (Observer for Palestine) said that, while his delegation would welcome the adoption of the draft resolution, it believed that the Council was not the appropriate forum in which to consider it. While his

(Mr. Shreim)

delegation welcomed the progress achieved in the negotiations between Israel and Jordan, it had strong reservations with regard to paragraph 3 (b) of the Washington Declaration concerning the status of Jerusalem. He stressed that a number of General Assembly and Security Council resolutions considered East Jerusalem a part of the Palestinian territories occupied in 1967.

Mr. RUNGE (Germany), speaking on behalf of the European Union, Austria, Finland and Sweden, expressed strong support for the Middle East peace process and recognized its fundamental political importance to the region. The States members of the European Union, Austria, Finland and Sweden would vote in favour of draft resolution E/1994/L.42. However, referring to General Assembly resolution 48/162 on the restructuring and revitalization of the United Nations in the economic, social and related fields, he said that an effort should be made to avoid duplication of debates in the Council and the General Assembly.

Mr. EL MOAKAF (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, stressed the purely political nature of the draft resolution. Action on such draft resolutions should be taken by the General Assembly, not the Economic and Social Council. Its submission to the Council was unprecedented. The Libyan Arab Jamahiriya had always advocated peace in the Middle East and the cessation of the conflicts which had claimed hundreds of thousands of Arab and Jewish lives. It could not, however, accept the fragile peace outlined in the Declaration of Principles or the Agreement on the Gaza Strip and the Jericho area, which constituted nothing but an Israeli scheme to take everything without giving anything in return. A comprehensive peace based on justice could be achieved only through the establishment of a democratic State of Palestine in a process similar to the one which had led in the establishment of the democratic State of South Africa. Under genuine peace, the weapons of mass destruction possessed by Israel would be placed under effective international control and Israel would be prevented from continuing to develop weapons of mass destruction and long-range missiles. For all of those reasons, his delegation would vote against draft resolution E/1994/L.42.

At the request of the representative of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, a recorded vote was taken on draft resolution E/1994/L.42.

In favour: Angola, Australia, Bangladesh, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark, Egypt, France, Gabon, Germany, Ghana, Greece, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Kuwait, Madagascar, mexico, Norway, Pakistan, Paraguay, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Senegal, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Venezuela, Zimbabwe

Against: Libyan Arab Jamahiriya

Abstaining: None

Draft resolution E/1994/L.42 was adopted by 47 votes to 1.

Mrs. BRENNEN (Bahamas) said that her delegation, which had not been present during the voting, wished to place on record that it would have voted in favour of draft resolution E/1994/L.42.

The PRESIDENT said that the Council had concluded its consideration of agenda item 7.

PERMANENT SOVEREIGNTY OVER NATIONAL RESOURCES IN THE OCCUPIED PALESTINIAN AND OTHER ARAB TERRITORIES (continued) (E/1994/L.34)

Draft resolution E/1994/L.34

Mr. ELIASHIV (Observer for Israel) said that the Declaration of Principles on Interim Self-Government Arrangements, signed by Israel and the PLO on 13 September 1993, stipulated that the issue of settlements would be discussed in the context of the permanent status negotiations.

The adoption of any resolution on the question of Israeli settlements would prejudge the outcome of these negotiations. The ongoing bilateral negotiations between Israel and the Palestinians and between Israel and Syria were the appropriate forums for addressing the issue. It was the responsibility of the United Nations to support the Declaration of Principles, which was an important step towards peace and reconciliation. Accordingly, the question of Israeli settlements should not be dealt with in the Council. Like the new positive resolutions on the Middle East peace process, all United Nations resolutions should reflect the latest realities in the Middle East and the hopes of its peoples for a better future.

Mr. COHEN (United States of America), speaking in explanation of vote before the voting, noted that it was somewhat of a fashion at the United Nations to adopt resolutions on an "as-tradition-dictates" basis even when such "traditional" resolutions did not adequately reflect changing situations.

(Mr. Cohen, United States)

The parties in the Middle East had moved beyond the positions set forth in draft resolution E/1994/L.34 and the Economic and Social Council should do likewise.

His Government's views on resolutions concerning issues concurrently under direct negotiation between parties in the region were well known. Concrete achievements had resulted from those negotiations. The Council should support the negotiating process in order to allow the parties to resolve their differences directly. The draft resolution essentially echoed General Assembly resolution 48/212, which his delegation had voted against. It would also vote against draft resolution E/1994/L.34, for it opposed language which, in its view, prejudged the outcome of negotiations.

The breakthroughs achieved in the past few months, including the signing of the Washington Declaration by Israel and Jordan, had greatly changed traditional approaches to the Arab-Israeli conflict. An effort should be made to avoid focusing on issues or statements which divided and polarized. He noted that the text recognized the ongoing Middle East peace process and the signing of the first implementation agreement of the Declaration of Principles by the Government of Israel and the PLO. That development, followed by the historic signing of the Washington Declaration, confirmed his delegation's view that the one-sided and outmoded language of the draft resolution before the Council was divisive and did not contribute to the negotiations. In particular, his delegation wished to point out that under the Declaration of Principles, the question of Israeli settlements and the question of the final status of Jerusalem were to be addressed in the final status negotiations.

His delegation was committed to the goal of a comprehensive, just and lasting peace settlement in the Middle East, achieved through direct negotiations between the parties on the basis of Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973). The actions of the parties in the region demonstrated that the difficult task of peacemaking was well under way. The Council should give its fullest support to that process without attempting to prejudge the outcome. For all of those reasons, his delegation would vote against the draft resolution and called upon other delegations to do likewise.

At the request of the representative of the United States of America, a recorded vote was taken on draft resolution E/1994/L.34.

In favour: Angola, Australia, Bahamas, Bangladesh, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark, Egypt, France, Gabon, Germany, Ghana, Greece, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Kuwait, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Mexico, Norway, Pakistan, Paraguay, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Senegal, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela, Zimbabwe

Against: United States of America

Abstaining: Belarus, Russian Federation, Ukraine

Draft resolution E/1994/L.34 was adopted by 46 votes to 1, with 3 abstentions.

Mr. EL MOAKAF (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya), speaking in explanation of vote, said that, while his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution, it did not endorse the paragraph which welcomed the signing of the first implementation agreement of the Declaration of Principles. It did not believe that it would culminate in the exercise of the right to self-determination by the Palestinian people. His delegation was in favour of a comprehensive peace based on justice, under which Israel was compelled to implement General Assembly and Security Council resolutions. That would uphold the credibility of the Security Council.

Mr. HUDYMA (Ukraine) said that his delegation had abstained, in the belief that the real solution lay in a comprehensive settlement of the Middle East question. The draft resolution did not fully take into account the current realities in the region or reflect the positive changes which had recently taken place and which represented a step towards such a comprehensive settlement. Ukraine stood ready to assist in achieving a prompt solution to the question of the Middle East, including the problem of Palestine, and would support any action taken with a view to achieving a firm and lasting peace in the region and the stable economic development of the Palestinian people.

Mr. NISHIMURA (Japan) said that, while his delegation had voted in favour of the draft resolution, if believed that political questions should not be taken up in the Economic and Social Council.

Mr. SHREIM (Observer for Palestine), while reaffirming his delegation's commitment to the Declaration of Principles, said that the United nations remained responsible for the question of Palestine until it was settled in all its aspects, including the question of settlements and refugees. Had United Nations resolutions condemning Israeli settlements as if

(Mr. Shreim)

legal and an obstacle to peace been respected and implemented, the situation might have been different. Indeed, the party which prejudged the outcome of the final status negotiations on the settlements was precisely the one which continued to expand those settlements despite its avowed commitment to the Declaration of Principles. It was not draft resolution E/1994/L.34 which prejudged the outcome, but rather the actual situation in the area.

The PRESIDENT said that the Council had concluded its consideration of agenda item 8.

COORDINATION QUESTIONS (continued)

(b) INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION IN THE FIELD OF INFORMATICS (continued) (E/1994/L.43)

Draft resolution E/1994/L.43

Draft resolution E/1994/L.43 was adopted.

(c) MULTISECTORAL COLLABORATION ON TOBACCO OR HEALTH (continued) (E/1994/L.38 and L.47)

Draft resolution E/1994/L.47

Mr. BARAC (Romania) said that draft resolution E/1994/L.47, which was submitted by the Vice-President of the Council on the basis of informal consultations, was a consensus text and he recommended that it should be adopted without a vote.

Ms. BOHN (United States of America) proposed that the word "in" after the words "the United Nations system focal point" in paragraph 5 should be replaced by the words "including on".

Draft resolution E/1994/L.47, as orally amended, was adopted.

The PRESIDENT said that, in the light of the adoption of draft resolution E/1994/L.47, he took it that draft resolution E/1994/L.38 was withdrawn.

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT said that the Council had concluded its consideration of agenda item 9.

PROGRAMME AND RELATED QUESTIONS IN THE ECONOMIC, SOCIAL AND RELATED FIELDS (continued) (E/1994/L.41)

Draft resolution E/1994/L.41

Mr. BARAC (Romania) said that an agreement had been reached in informal consultations to take no action on draft resolution E/1994/L.41,

(Mr. Barac, Romania)

outlined "Modalities of reporting in the economic, social and related fields", and to transmit it, together with the report of the Secretary-General on that question (E/1994/88), to the General Assembly for consideration at its forty-ninth session.

Mr. DUGAN (United States of America) said that, as a sponsor of the draft resolution, his delegation was pleased that it would be transmitted to the General Assembly for its consideration. Although the draft resolution was currently drafted for purposes of the Council's deliberations, his delegation hoped that, when it was taken up by the General Assembly, the documentation of United Nations bodies which were not subsidiary bodies of the Council would also be considered, with a view to streamlining the documentation process throughout the United Nations system.

Mr. DOUJAK (Observer for Austria) supported the remarks made by the United States representative and said that his delegation looked forward to the debate in the General Assembly on the question.

The PRESIDENT said he took it that the Council wished to take a decision to transmit draft resolution E/1994/L.41, together with the report of the Secretary-General in document E/1994/88, to the General Assembly for further consideration.

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT suggested that the Council should adopt the draft decision contained in paragraph 15 of the note by the Secretary-General on changes of dates for sessions of subsidiary bodies of the Economic and Social Council in 1995 (E/1994/118). The proposed dates for the inter-sessional meeting of the open-ended Group on the Review of Arrangements for Consultations with Non-Governmental Organizations were 7 and 8 November 1995 and that information should be included in paragraph (b) of the draft decision.

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT said that the Council had concluded its consideration of agenda item 12.

QUESTION OF DECLARING 1998 INTERNATIONAL YEAR OF THE OCEAN (continued) (E/1994/L.39)

Draft resolution E/1994/L.39

Mr. JERONIMO (Portugal) said that Benin, Brazil, Cape Verde, Cuba and Guinea-Bissau had joined the sponsors of draft resolution E/1994/L.39.

Draft resolution E/1994/L.39 was adopted.

The PRESIDENT said that the Council had concluded its consideration of agenda item 13.

QUESTION OF DECLARING 1995 INTERNATIONAL YEAR TO OBSERVE THE ONE THOUSANDTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE MANAS EPIC (continued) (E/1994/L.31 and L.46)

Draft resolution E/1994/L.46

Mr. BOTEZ (Romania) introduced draft resolution E/1994/L.46, entitled "Commemoration of the millennium of the Kyrgyz national epic, Manas, which was submitted on the basis of informal consultations on draft resolution E/1994/L.31. He recommended that it should be adopted without a vote.

Mr. JUDRYAVTSEV (russian Federation) said that his delegation supported the observance of the one thousandth anniversary of the Manas epic, under the auspices of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), in cooperation with Kyrgyzstan, in order to foster cultural understanding among nations.

Draft resolution E/1994/L.46 was adopted

Mr. ASIRDIN (Indonesia) said that his country shared many interests and concerns with the sponsors of draft resolution E/1994/L.46 and it believed that it was important to preserve cultural, historical and religious traditions which were sometimes conveyed through epics such as the Mahábhárata. His delegation had therefore supported the draft resolution. However, it was important that any event proposed to the Economic and Social Council for international observance must be globally commemorable, and in future such a parameter should be set by the Council.

Mr. ATABEKOV (Kyrgyzstan) thanked the sponsors of the draft resolution and said that a firm foundation had been set for consideration of the Manas epic at the forty-ninth session of the General Assembly.

The PRESIDENT said that, in the light of the adoption of draft resolution E/1994/L.46, he took it that draft resolution E/1994/L.31 was withdrawn.

It was so decided.

The PRESIDENT said that the Council had concluded its consideration of agenda item 14.

SUSPENSION OF THE SESSION

The PRESIDENT said that at the current session an attempt had been made to put into practice the new, experimental procedures proposed by the Bureau in response to the General Assembly's decisions on the restructuring and revitalization of the United Nations in the economic, social and related fields. He felt that the Council had implemented those procedures both effectively and efficiently; it had adopted fewer resolutions and decisions than in 1993 and, whenever possible, had discussed and acted on each subject once and once only. Delegations had engaged in true debate and increased cooperation while reducing formal speeches and disputes. True decisions, defined as actions which caused something to happen, had been taken. The Council must, however, follow-up the implementation of those decisions and develop its agenda further for that purpose.

He stressed the importance of the high-level segment and said that the Agenda for Development would be discussed again by the General Assembly at its forty-ninth session. He welcomed the Secretary-General's recent appointment of a senior adviser on all aspects of the operational activities and policies of the United Nations system.

It was regrettable that the participation by ministers and the executive heads of agencies had been limited and it was to be hoped that the increased efficiency of the Council would result in increased participation by the agencies. He also felt that the high-level policy dialogue had been too adversarial and that the coordination segment had brought too few items to conclusion.

In 1993, the Secretary-General had suggested that the Council should be invited to report to the Security Council on economic and social issues which constituted threats to international peace and security, and that the Council should introduce a flexible, high-level intersessional mechanism to respond in a timely way to new developments. He himself had been wondering whether the Council should not take up the issue of the recent tragedy in Rwanda but he had decided not to raise the issue mainly because, in a fast-moving situation, senior officials were better employed on the scene of the crisis than in reporting to United Nations bodies. However, in retrospect, he felt that the Council should perhaps have at least added its voice to those of the Secretary-General and other United Nations organs. The mandate of the Economic and Social Council was different from that of the Security Council in

(The President)

that it included humanitarian issues, and he proposed to hold informal consultations on the establishment of a continuing mechanism for dealing with such crises.

Mr. BELHIMEUR (Algeria), speaking on behalf of the Group of 77 and China, welcomed the President's comments regarding the new Council procedures. He regretted that not all delegations had been able to study the documents of the Council in depth, particularly during the last few days of the session.

After the customary exchange of courtesies, the PRESIDENT declared the substantive session of 1994 suspended.

The meeting rose at 4.55 p.m.